

IV. Remarks

Claims 1-5, 21 and 22 presently stand pending and rejected on the basis of prior art. By this paper, Applicants are amending claims 1-5. Reconsideration and further examination of this application are respectfully requested.

Objections to the Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings because they fail to include the approved corrections to Figures 3B and 4 which were filed July 14, 2003, and because the protruding portion of second layer 36 added to Figure 5 suggests that material was added to the top of the outer surface of layer 36.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's objection regarding Figures 3B and 4 because Applicants did not propose or submit any amendments to these Figures in the Response to the previous Office Action received by the Examiner on December 8, 2003.

Regarding the Examiner's objection to Figure 5, Figure 5 has been amended to show the protruding portion of the second layer 36 as a continuation of the second layer 36.

An annotated copy of Figure 5 showing the drawing corrections and an amended formal drawing correction copy of Figure 5 are included in this amendment.

Objections to the Claims

The Examiner objected to the status designation of claim 3 for being identified as "original". The status of claim 3 has been designated as "Currently Amended".

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 21, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement because the Examiner asserted that the limitation "deformable" features in claim 1 was not described in the original specification as filed.

The recitation of "deformable" has been deleted from claim 1. Additionally, claims 2-5, 21, and 22 depend indirectly from claim 1. Therefore the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-5, 21, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph is moot.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101

The Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 21, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being inoperative and therefore lacking utility because the Examiner asserted that the recited “deformable” features in claim 1 would necessarily lack such compressive strength.

The recitation of “deformable” has been deleted from claim 1. Additionally, claims 2-5, 21, and 22 depend indirectly from claim 1. Therefore the Examiner’s rejection of claims 1-5, 21, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is moot.

Further Claim Clarifications

It is believed that a brief discussion of the current form of the claims of this application is warranted. Independent claim 1 and dependent claims 2-5 have been amended to clarify, more particularly to point out and distinctly claim that which applicants regard as the subject matter of the present invention.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite a *hollow* cylindrical shaft body and *at least one feature protruding through portions of* the shaft body. (Emphasis added). Figures 5 and 7 in the original application as filed disclose a hollow cylindrical body 34 having at least one feature 17 protruding through portions of the cylindrical body 34. Therefore, no new matter has been added.

Additionally, Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the features include a head *portion* and an anchor *portion*. (Emphasis added). No new matter has been added.

Furthermore, Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the layer of composite fibrous material extends around and over the entirety of the shaft body and *over* the at least one feature. (Emphasis added). The paragraph beginning on page 7, line 29 and ending on page 8, line 3 discloses that the second layer of composite fibrous material 36 is applied around the whole assembly. Additionally, Figures 5 and 7 as originally filed disclose the continuous second layer of composite fibrous material 36 extending over the features 17. Therefore, no new matter has been added.

Applicants respectfully assert that amended claim 1 is not disclosed by any of the references cited by the Examiner.

Claims 2-5 have been amended to consistently refer to the head *portion*, the anchor *portion*, and the *at least one* feature. (Emphasis added).


Claims 2-5, 21, and 22 depend on claim 1. Therefore, applicants assert that claims 1-5, 21, and 22 are allowable.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present form of the claims are patentably distinguishable over the art of record and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Therefore, Applicants request that the Examiner grant early allowance of these claims. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney for the Applicants via telephone number (734) 302-6000, if such communication would expedite this application.

Respectfully submitted,

April 9, 2004
Date


Jon H. Beaupré (Reg. No. 54,729)
Attorneys/Agent for Applicant

ANNOTATED MARKED-UP DRAWING

Sheet 3 of 4

Case No.: 10541-780 -- Visteon Case No.: V200-0538

Inventor(s): Bradley et al

Title: Enhanced Strength Composite Drive Shaft




Fig. 7




Fig. 8

